

Kohichiroh MAEMURA., S.N. 10/607,066
Page 11

Dkt. 2271/69634

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 4, 2007. Claims 1-10 were pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6 and 8-10 have been amended to correct informalities therein, claims 1, 6 and 10 have been amended to clarify the subject matter claimed therein, and new claims 11-17 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-17 are now pending, with claims 1, 6, 10, 12 and 15 being in independent form.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as purportedly anticipated by Tsuji (JP 11-355347).

Tsuji (JP 11-355347) is discussed briefly in the background section of this application. Tsuji proposes a method for controlling a network facsimile to allow e-mails to be transferred only when they are from user-designated mail addresses and domains.

However, such mail address and domain information are not designated when electronic mail is transmitted to the transmission destination corresponding to the mail address and domain information.

In contrast, in the network facsimile apparatus of claim 1, an electronic mail address memory stores the electronic mail address of the transmission destination, *when* the network facsimile apparatus transmits the electronic mail to the transmission destination, and thereafter e-mails received by the network facsimile apparatus from the transmission destination would not be scrapped. That is, an electronic mail scrap determination device determines that a received electronic mail is to be scrapped when the received electronic mail is not from a sender to which e-mails have been sent (determined based on the electronic mail address or domain information stored in the electronic mail address memory) by the network facsimile.

Tsuji neither teaches nor suggests such features. Therefore, independent claim 1, 6 and

Kohichiroh MAEMURA., S.N. 10/607,066
Page 12

Dkt. 2271/69634

10, as well as new independent claims 12 and 15, are patentably distinct from the cited art.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 6, 10, 12 and 15, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentable over the cited art, for at least the reasons discussed above.

The Office Action also states that claims 3, 8 and 9 were objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, and that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

However, since independent claims 1 and 6 are submitted to be patentable over the cited art, no changes to the form of claims 3, 8 and 9 are believed to be necessary.

In view of the remarks hereinabove, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, and earnestly solicits the allowance of the application.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees that are required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Teng, Reg. No. 40,837
Attorney for Applicant
Cooper & Dunham LLP
Tel.: (212) 278-0400